

source code of a computer program. The Office Action specifically cites Col. 6, Lines 1-67 and Abstract as allegedly disclosing the elements claimed in the present application. In those sections, Devanbu appears to disclose producing an independent parse tree from a dependent parse tree. Col. 6, Lines 8-10 specifically states "...this creates a set of translation routines (305) that implement the attributed parse tree abstract data type layer, and an abstract syntax dictionary."

It is submitted that Devanbu does not disclose or suggest every element claimed in independent claims 1, 8, and 15. For example, Devanbu does not disclose or suggest "receiving a first attribute of a first input field type and a second attribute of a first output field type ... dynamically creating at runtime a first optimized conversion routine based on said first attribute and said second attribute ...; and executing said first optimized conversion routine from said application program to convert said first input field type to said first output field type" as claimed in Claim 1. In Devanbu, there is no mention of converting input field types and output field types because Devanbu is not concerned with converting one field type to another. Rather, Devanbu is concerned with parsing a source code.

Further, Devanbu does not disclose or suggest "dynamically creating at runtime a plurality of data field conversion routines for each set of input attributes and output attributes" as claimed in independent claims 8 and 15. Accordingly, it is submitted that independent claims 1, 8, and 15 are patentably distinct over Devanbu.

With regard to the rejection of claims 7, 13, 14, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), it is submitted that because Devanbu does not disclose or suggest every element claimed in claims 1, 8, and 15, and because neither Kiwahara nor Mcallum discloses that which Devanbu fails to disclose, these claims are also patentably distinct over the cited references.

This communication is believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action and every effort has been made to place the application in condition for allowance. The claims, in view of the foregoing explanation, are believed to be patentable over the prior art, and a favorable Office Action is hereby earnestly solicited.

If a telephone interview would be of assistance in advancing prosecution of the

subject application, Examiner is requested to telephone the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 10, 2003

Eunhee Park

Eunhee Park  
Registration No. 42,976  
Baker & McKenzie  
805 Third Avenue  
New York, NY 10022  
Telephone (212) 751-5700  
Facsimile (212) 759-9133